

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 18-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 have been amended. Claims 4, 5, and 9-17 have been cancelled. Claims 6 and 18 have been withdrawn. Claim 21 has been added. Claims 1 and 21 are in independent form.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner has objected to the phrase in lines 10-11 of claim 1. In response, Applicant has amended lines 9-12 to read --said body portion of said runner is disposed in said primary channel which prevents rotation of said runner about said central axis and said trunnions are disposed in said secondary channel thereby coupling said runner and said carrier together for movement of said carrier with said runner in said vertical direction--.

The Examiner has objected to the phrase “whereby rotational and translational movement” due to a lack of antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended line 15 to read --whereby a rotational and translational movement-- such that there is now proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner has objected to the phrase in line 6 of claim 1. In response, Applicant has amended lines 4-5 to read --said runner drivingly engaged with said guide rod, said runner moveable in said vertical direction--.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, and 19-20 depend from amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,241,542 to Podolon et al. and U.S. Patent 2,945,691 to Swift et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation “wherein said carrier rotates about said lateral axis and said carrier translates in a horizontal direction substantially orthogonal to said vertical and lateral directions such that said trunnions move relative to said carrier in said horizontal direction within said secondary channel in response to moving said runner between said first and second positions.”

Podolon discloses a first yoke 38 and a second yoke 40 which are pivotally interconnected by a pair of riveted pivot pins 42. The Examiner contends that the first yoke 38 and the pivot pins 42 disclosed in Podolon are equivalent to a runner (36) and trunnions (40a, 40b) in the present application. The Examiner also contends that the second yoke 40 and the holes for the pivot pins 42 disclosed in Podolon are equivalent to a window carrier (18) and secondary channels (50a, 50b) in the present application. The pivot pins 42 only allow the second yoke 40 to pivot relative to the first yoke 38. The pivot pins 42 do not move relative to the second yoke 40 in a horizontal direction within the holes for the pivot pins 42, as specifically required by amended claim 1. Thus, each and every limitation of amended claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited references. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 7, 8, and 19 depend from amended claim 1 and, as such, are construed to incorporate by reference all of the limitations of the claim to which they refer, *see* 35 U.S.C. §112, fourth paragraph. Amended claim 1 is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Thus, claims 7, 8, and 19 are also allowable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Podolon and Swift be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Podolon and Swift as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,106,353 to Kondo. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 2 depends from amended claim 1 and, as such, is construed to incorporate by reference all of the limitations of the claim to which it refers, *see* 35 U.S.C. §112, fourth paragraph. Amended claim 1 is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Thus, claim 2 is also allowable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Podolon and Swift as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kondo be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 3 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant has added new independent claim 21 which includes base claim 1 and allowable claim 3. Thus, new independent claim 21 is allowable.

Appl'n No: 10/580,928
Amdt dated May 3, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

It is respectfully submitted that this patent application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment or the patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee associated with this Communication to Deposit Account No. 50-1759. A duplicate of this form is attached.

Respectfully submitted,



David J. Ford (Reg. No. 62,462)
Clark Hill PLC
500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226-3435
(313) 965-8575

Date: May 3, 2010
Attorney Docket No: 19339-136123